



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ATTIC ARCHONS FROM 294 TO 262 B.C.

BY ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON

The vexed problem of the dates of the Attic archons we have always with us. Since Professor Ferguson made his brilliant discovery of the rotation of the secretary-cycle,¹ there has been no end to the discussion of the problems of dating the Athenian documents.² New cycles are being constructed with almost cyclic regularity, with new breaks and the insertion of new tribes. Even if some of these theories are wrong, they provoke discussion and often help either directly or incidentally to advance the sum total of our knowledge. I think that we are far from finality on this subject as yet. I hope, however, that this investigation of a very limited field may mark an advance in our study of the early third century.

In the latest publication of the epigraphical documents of Attic history, Professor Kirchner accepts, apparently without change, the secretary-cycle as published by Ferguson.³ By this system, Diokles is dated in the year 290/289 against the literary evidence, and the history of the years 290-280 is changed to accord with this date.⁴ Ferguson and Kirchner allow no breaks between 307 and 262. Kolbe allows two breaks, which correct themselves rather curiously, in 288/287 and 284/283 for no apparent reason whatever, so far as Kolbe interprets to us the history of the period.⁵ More recently Tarn apparently allows at least three breaks, 292/291,

¹ "The Athenian Secretaries," *Cornell Studies*, VII (1898). For his corrected final list see *Priests of Asklepios*, 131-38.

² The following works may be referred to: Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, III, 2, 32 ff.; Ferguson, "The Athenian Archons of the Third and Second Centuries B.C.," *Cornell Studies*, X (1899); *The Priests of Asklepios* (1907); Kirchner, *GGA* (1900), 435 ff.; *BPW* (1906), 980 ff.; *ibid.* (1909), 844 ff.; Kolbe, "Die attischen Archonten," *Abhandlungen der königl. Gesells. der Wissens. zu Göttingen*, Band X, No. 4; Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas*, 415 ff. To save space, I give these references here, and those who wish to look up the data for any particular archon under discussion should refer to these works. All the available information is cited by Kolbe. For the period under discussion Tarn presents the evidence very clearly for the years 292-282.

³ *Inscriptiones Graecae*, II and III, editio minor, Part I, Fasc. 1, 1913 (ed. Kirchner).

⁴ Cf. Ferguson, *Klio* (1905), 155, 179; *Hellenistic Athens*, 136 ff.

⁵ Kolbe, *op. cit.*, 18 ff.

285/284, and 284/283, which also correct themselves, with unexplained and inexplicable omissions, but permits the cycle to go on in 281/280 as if nothing had ever happened to it.¹

Was the cycle ever broken during these years? and when? and why? These are questions which must be answered fully and satisfactorily before Ferguson's arrangement can be disturbed. I think that we can find the whole solution of the problem in *IG*, II², 682, which not only gives proof that the cycle must have been broken, but better still tells us when it was broken, and also, though not so clearly, but clearly enough to put the matter beyond question, the reasons for it.

In this decree the record of Phaidros is given. He is pro-Demetrian or pro-Macedonian throughout. The decree itself was passed when Athens was under the authority of Antigonos Gonatas. In lines 43-53 it is recorded that Phaidros was elected hoplite general in the archonship of Xenophon. Most of the lines describing his services in that post (or in the years between the archonship of Xenophon and that of Nikias Otryneus) are excised, it is true, but the interpretation of the excised lines is as clear as the parts of the text preserved. That is, they deal with his services to Demetrios either in caring for sacrifices or in other offices, but at any rate there was mention of Demetrios. Now in the cycle as adopted by Ferguson and Kirchner, Xenophon must be placed in 286/285, when Athens is allied with Lysimachos and at bitter odds with her rejected king, Demetrios.² The services of the pro-Macedonian Phaidros can never have been rendered at any time after the revolt of Athens from Demetrios. Therefore Xenophon must be placed before the archonship of Diokles. It is equally out of the question to place Xenophon in any year between the archonship of Diokles and that of Nikias Otryneus. In the old cycle Diokles is placed in 290/289 and there is no room for any archon between Kimon and Diokles. It is impossible, of course, to place Xenophon before Kimon or after Nikias Otryneus.

The date of Xenophon can be easily established. From the lines in *IG*, II², 682, that are preserved, we learn that Phaidros was

¹ Tarn, *op. cit.*, 415 ff.

² Ferguson's explanation of this in *Hellenistic Athens*, 142, n. 1, is unsatisfactory. See Tarn's criticism, *loc. cit.*

the *first* general for the hoplites in his archonship. The interpretation of this expression is plain. He was the pro-Demetrian candidate and served in the first part of the year. The *second* election took place when the Athenians revolted in the course of the year—probably toward spring—and elected army officers of democratic sympathies. He was, therefore, the archon who immediately preceded Diokles; for it is certain that Demochares returned from exile in that year, and we may conclude that the revolution had come just before his return.¹

Since Philippos, Charinos, Kimon, and Xenophon must all be placed before Diokles and after 294/293, it is plain that the last-named cannot be placed in the year 290/289. It follows that the secretary-cycle must be broken somewhere between 294/293 and the archonship of Diokles. The inevitable result is that all the archons between the years 290 (or 292) and 262 must again, if I may use Professor Kolbe's figure, be rudely disturbed from their Procrustean bed, only, however, to be dangled unmercifully Scinnian fashion between the treetops of the secretary-cycle and the historical data. Let us then seek some fixed point between 294 and 262 with which the cycle may be connected.

Of the archons of this period we are absolutely sure of Anaxikrates, Demokles, Pytharatos, Diognetos, and Antipatros. But though we are certain of the dates of these archons, destiny has willed hitherto that the secretaries of none of them should be recorded. Gorgias may be dated in 284/283 or 280/279.² Euboulos belongs apparently to the first year of an Olympiad, and Peithidemos comes at the beginning of the Chremonidean war, which fluctuates between 268 and 266.³ Polyuktos comes before the establishment of the Soteiria at Delphi, but whether these were established in the same year as the Pythia or two years after, and whether annual, biennial,

¹ Tarn, *loc. cit.*

² Beloch observed that the reading of the Codex Parisinus was δεκάτω Δ ἔτει ὕστερον and suggested that the original reading was ἰδ' ἔτει ὕστερον (Ps. Plut. *Vitae X Oratorum* 847 D).

³ Dittenberger (*SIG*, 214) and Lehmann-Haupt (*Klio*, V, 375 ff.) date this in 268. Ferguson first placed Peithidemos in 267/266, but later in 266/265 because of the secretary-cycle, and the latter date has found general acceptance though it has always been difficult.

or quadrennial must still be settled.¹ The date of Philokrates rests on an untrustworthy manuscript tradition which allows a date anywhere between 270 and 266.² Diokles, Diotimos, Isaïos, and Euthios follow each other in the order named. This is surely a combination to delight the lover of permutations and combinations and to bring despair to any seeker after historical accuracy. But luckily the situation is not so hopeless as it seems; for the evidence of the inscriptions themselves, combined with that gained from the literary sources, helps us to determine certain fixed points which may ultimately give us the clue.

Let us first take up the problem of dating Diokles. Since the continuity of the secretary-cycle is admittedly broken in the last half of the first decade of the third century, we are free to place him wherever literary and epigraphical evidence permits us to do so, and all this urges the year 288/287.³ Let us take this as our pivotal point and base the secretary-cycle upon it. The secretary for the year is from Aigeis. If we work backward we find that Antigonis would have held the secretaryship in 291/290. Now we know that the cycle was kept up from 302 to 295/294 and in the latter year the secretaryship was held by Aiantis.⁴ In the spring of this year the tyranny of Lachares fell, and Demetrios regained possession of Athens.⁵ Was the secretary-cycle broken in the following year? If so we should have expected Antigonis to hold the secretaryship. Unfortunately our evidence is too slight to draw any definite conclusion. We know only that the second letter of the deme of the secretary was omicron, and should, unless there is a lacuna, consist at the least of ten letters.⁶ If the regular rotation was undisturbed,

¹ *Goett. Gel. Anz.* (1913), No. 3; a review of Walek, *Die delphische Amphiktyonie in der Zeit der aetolischen Herrschaft*, von Edm. Rusch, mit Erläuterungen und Zusätzen von H. Pomtow, pp. 125-88; see especially pp. 178 ff.

² Schoene, *Eusebios-Hieronymos*, II, 121; cf. Jacoby, *Apollodoros Chronik*, 343.

³ See Kolbe, *op. cit.*, 27 ff.; Tarn, *loc. cit.* The latter states the evidence very clearly, and I do not see that anything further can be added to his argument, or that any valid objection can be urged against it. For that reason I have refrained from repeating it.

⁴ Ferguson, *Priests of Asklepios*, 132.

⁵ Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, 134 ff.

⁶ *IG*, II², 649, lines 1-2, restoring *Ἰπποθωριδός* as the name of the prytanizing tribe.

the secretaryship went to Antiochis. There is one deme (*Κολωνήθεν*) of this tribe which might be restored, but it has only nine letters. There are only two demes which have the other qualifications, *Κονθυλίδης* and *Κορυδαλλεύς*, but neither of these belongs to Antiochis or to Antigonis. The latter in fact is some back-in-the-hills deme and a bare handful of names are recorded from it; so it is probably not to be considered.¹ *Κονθυλίδης* is possible—but still we have no objection to urge against Kolonos except that its restoration requires us to assume a lacuna of at least one space on the stone. Such a lacuna is admissible and we cannot use it to prove that the cycle was or was not broken in 294/293. Still it must be admitted that *Κονθυλίδης* is the better restoration, and the new style of dating adopted in this inscription probably indicates some unusual changes from the usual routine.

There is no evidence at hand for the tribe of the secretary in the archonship of Philippos.

If we may be allowed to anticipate our argument somewhat, we shall present here the proof for the disturbance in the archonship of Kimon. Taking for granted what we shall prove later, we will consider here *IG*, II², 670. The first decree in this inscription belongs to the archonship of Kimon; for that is the only restoration possible of all the names of archons between 322 and 291/290, where Aristonymos is placed. The secretary in Kimon's year comes from Eleusis, which belongs to the tenth tribe in the official order. There is no doubt, then, that the secretary-cycle was utterly out of joint in 292/291, and since we should not expect this in a year when the tribe Demetrias in the usual order of things would have held the secretaryship, we infer that the cycle was thrown over when Demetrios came into power and the extreme oligarchs formed his advisory council.²

As we have already inferred that the tribe Antigonis held the secretaryship in 291/290 and also that there is the possibility of a regular sequence between 291/290 and 288/287, it would seem that the disorder which is found in Kimon's archonship is resolved into order in the following year. This is the crucial point, and if we can

¹ *Kirchner, Pros. Att.*, II, 564.

² Cf. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, 136 ff.; Tarn, 44. See especially n. 1, p. 263.

find some good explanation for the period of anarchy and for the restoration of the cycle in its usual rotation in 291/290, our main problem is solved. Let us turn again to *IG*, II², 682; here we find our answer in lines 30–40; *χειροτονηθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου ἐπὶ τὰ ὅπλα στρατηγὸς τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν τὸν ἐπὶ Κίμωνος ἄρχοντος διετέλεσεν ἀγωνιζόμενος ὑπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας, καὶ περιστάντων τῷ πόλει καιρῶν δυσκόλων διεφύλαξεν τὴν εἰρήνην τῇ χώρᾳ ἀποφαινόμενος αἰεὶ τὰ κράτιστα, καὶ τὸν σῖτον ἐκ τῆς χώρας καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους καρποὺς αἴτιος ἐγένετο εἰσκομισθῆναι, συμβουλεύσας τῷ δήμῳ συντελέσαι . . . καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἐλευθέραν καὶ δημοκρατουμένην αὐτόνομον παρέδωκεν καὶ τοὺς νόμους κυρίου τοῖς μεθ' αὐτόν . . . διετέλεσε κτλ.*

The inference from all this is plain. Phaidros fought against the ultra-oligarchs for the "safety" and not less for the "freedom" of the state, and succeeded in handing over the government in the following year "free" (with a pro-Macedonian qualification to the adjective) and administering the government under democratic forms (*δημοκρατουμένην*). The "hard times" may not refer so much to external enemies as to the effects of the oligarchical government. If so, we must read the history of these years 294–292 somewhat otherwise than has hitherto been done. What we needed to prove is now established, and the measure of democracy which Phaidros secured pleased the grateful people so much that they could do no less than give the secretaryship to Antigonis in the following elections rather than continue on from Hippothontis, which had held the secretaryship in the previous year.

Since, then, the secretary-cycle began with Antigonis in 291/290, and since there is good evidence that the democratic forms of government were restored at this time, we may assume that the usual rotation was followed. We can therefore reconcile literary tradition with the cycle and date Diokles in the year 288/287. Does the cycle continue uninterrupted until 262/261? Here is where we find difficulties thick about us, but unless there are good reasons for breaking the order because of some change of government, we should naturally let the cycle run its course. Kolbe and Tarn have argued for two breaks, which correct themselves, in the years 288–282, although they admit no change of government at Athens during these years. Polyeyktos and the Soteiria at Delphi are to blame for this perversion

because it has become traditional to date the Soteiria in 274/273, and with Polyeuktos dated in the year preceding, the secretary-cycle must be squared with tradition. Search as I may, however, I can find not the slightest bit of evidence in support of the tradition except the secretary-cycle itself; and thus we have an excellent example of the *argumentum in cyclo*. Pomtow, however, contends that the Soteiria were celebrated for the first time in 276/275, but, so far as I can find, without winning general acceptance.¹ Indeed his argument has the same fault as the other; for, using the Sotion inscription as his evidence for dating the Soteiria in 277/276—although this appears to be generally discredited—he dates Kraton in 277/276; and since in his archonship the mover of the decree in Polyeuktos' year is given *προξενία* at Delphi, therefore Polyeuktos must be dated in that year. If, however, the Sotion inscription cannot be dated in 277/276, the rest of Pomtow's argument does not follow.

Now in order to illustrate the failings of my predecessors, I shall myself date the Soteiria in 272/271, solely on the basis of the secretary-cycle by which Polyeuktos is placed in the year 273/272. I ask only, however, that fair consideration be given the cycle as I now construct it, and on this the whole argument rests. I contend that when the new cycle began in 291/290 it was carried down to 262/261 without a break. If we consider the archons of this period, dated according to this presumption, all the epigraphical evidence is in accord with our other sources of information.

But we must first consider the cycle of the priests of Asklepios by which Ferguson has placed Isaïos in 288/287.² As a matter of fact I do not see that we *must* assume that the priests followed a regular rotation in appointment between the years 307/306 and 276/275. There is a break between IG, II, 835 and 836, which came in the archonship of Euboulos. That might mean that his archonship marked some reform, but it is useless to discuss the point with only one inscription and one priest as evidence. One example does not make a rule. If, however, the regular rotation was followed, the explanation of the date of Isaïos in 286/285 is easy. A glance at the

¹ GGA (1913), 178 ff.; Ferguson, *Hell. Ath.*, 164, n. 1; cf. Kirchner, IG, II², 680

² Ferguson, *Priests of Asklepios*, 140 ff.

table will show that the tribes Antigonis and Demetrias in natural rotation would fill the priesthood in 285/284 and 284/283 respectively. But hatred of Macedon was violent in these years. Drop these two tribes from the cycle and the problem is solved. Isaïos is thus dated in 286/285 and the two cycles are reconciled. It may be noted in passing that, if we carry the priests' cycle back to 307/306 with the omission of the two tribes, Antigonis would have held the office of priest in that year. But how early in 307 were the two tribes created? From the arrangement of prytanies in *IG*, II², 455, 456, we may infer that the new tribes were established within the first prytany of the year, if not at the very beginning. Since the secretaryship did not go to Antigonis, we may infer that the new tribes were not in existence when the elections were held. If, however, the priestship went to Antigonis, we must conclude that the priest of Asklepios was elected at a different time and later than the civil authorities. The year of the latter was *κατ' ἄρχοντα*; of the former, *κατὰ θεόν*.

If, then, we begin our secretary-cycle in 291/290, it is carried into the democratic government following the fall of Demetrios without any break, as we learn from the inscriptions of Diokles' year. The first year in which a break might be expected is 279/278. In the archonship of Nikias Otryneus, Athens surrendered to Antigonos Gonatas, and a pro-Macedonian government came into power, retaining, however, democratic forms and privileges.¹ But it chanced curiously enough that the secretaryship in the coming elections fell to Antigonis, and there is no likelihood that the two Macedonian tribes were passed over. No change was made or likely to be made during Phaidros' lifetime, and while our knowledge of Athens' political affiliations from 271 to 268 is exceedingly vague, I am inclined to think that there was nothing sufficiently violent to cause such a disturbance. At the beginning of the Chremonidean war the violent Nationalists might have rejected the Macedonian tribes, but it is probable that they did not. I have chosen to construct the cycle without any break, because I believe that the historical evidence favors the year 267/266 for Peithidemos. In that case there was certainly no break in the cycle, as we learn from the decrees of the following year.

¹ Tarn, *op. cit.*, 127, n. 36.

We may now consider the archon lists which we have reconstructed using the secretary-cycle as our chief authority; perhaps we may be following it too blindly, but, since there is often no other guide, and since its value is indisputable all through the third and second centuries of the pre-Christian era, we see no reason for discrediting it here.

There is no doubt that Olympiodoros belongs to the year 294/293. His secretary may belong to Antiochis, following the regular rotation, but I suspect that the proper restoration of *IG*, II², 649, is as follows:

[ἐπ]ὶ Ὁ[λυμ]πι[ο]δώρο[υ] ἀ[ρ]χο[ντος καὶ γραμματέως . . .]
 [δω]ρο[υ τοῦ] Ἐ[π]ιτέλου [Κ]ο[νθυλίδου Ἰπποθων]-
 [τί]δος κτλ.

In that case the secretaryship went to some ultra-oligarch belonging to the tribe Pandionis, and little or no regard was paid to the forms of the old democracy.

Philippos is dated in 293/292 by Dionysios of Halicarnassus, and there does not seem to be any valid reason for displacing him.¹

Kimón must come in the period of anarchy and just before the establishment of the secretary-cycle in 292/291, if our interpretation of *IG*, II², 682, is correct.² To this year we assign the first decree in *IG*, II², 670, and correct the restoration of lines 16-17 as follows: [καὶ στεφανῶσαι] αὐτὸν χρυσῶι [στεφάνωι κατὰ τὸν νόμον ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα κτλ]. There is no other possible date, if Kirchner's restoration of line 1 with an archon's name containing seven letters in the genitive form is correct, as apparently it seems to be. The secretary coming from Hippothontis in this year gives clear proof of the disturbance in the years immediately following the surrender of Athens to Demetrios in 295/294.

Beginning with 291/290 we follow the secretary-cycle without a break until 262/261. Aristonymos is dated by his secretary in 291/290. Charinos must come before Diokles, and since his name can be restored in *IG*, II², 697, whose secretary belongs to the second tribe, there is no doubt that this is the correct restoration. The only

¹ Ferguson has agreed that Philippos should be dated in 293/292 (*Deutsche Literaturzeitung* [1910], 1953).

² Tarn, *op. cit.*, 421 ff.

other possibility is [ἐπὶ Κίμωνος], but this is, I think, clearly excluded for reasons already stated. Perhaps the point is open to discussion, but *IG*, II², 682 would not be easily explained if Kimon were dated in 290/289.

Xenophon, Diokles, Diotimos, Isaïos, Euthios, Ourios, Menekles, Nikias Otryneus, Anaxikrates, and Demokles call for no special comment, as their interrelation follows automatically from the internal evidence of the inscriptions and the literary sources.¹ It should be noted, however, that *IG*, II², 662, can no longer be assigned to Menekles. The restoration ἐπὶ Μενεκλέου instead of ἐπὶ Μενεκλέους in the prescript has always been unsatisfactory. Moreover, Lysimachos was dead long before this decree was passed, and we cannot believe that the embassies in *IG*, II², 662, 663, were conducted by Hermes. The correct restoration of *IG*, II², 662, is [ἐπὶ Διοκλέους], which not only fills the line, but brings these embassies into relation with those of Demochares at the beginning of the war.

It may be urged against our dating Nikias Otryneus in 280/279 that the Athenian struggle for independence ends two years too late. But the date of the end of this struggle has always been fixed by the secretary-cycle; so we may use the same argument for our side. Undoubtedly Athens went over to the side of Antigonos during the year of Nikias' archonship. The change of *agonothetes* shows this, especially when the second appointment was pro-Macedonian; and Phaidros, too, is a guaranty that the change was not accompanied by an oligarchy of the violent type.

Gorgias must be dated during the years when the Nationalist party was in control, and comes therefore between Xenophon and Nikias Otryneus. Otherwise the decreeing of honors to Demochares is impossible, and we do not believe that purely academic motions and decrees were put or carried in the partisan governments of the day. We may date Gorgias ten or fourteen years before Pytharatos, who is fixed in 271/270, according as we interpret our manuscript authority.² Since our interpretation is always biased by our secretary-cycle, we do not hesitate to accept Beloch's reading and date Gorgias in 284/283.

¹ The detailed information about these archons may be sought in the works cited in note 2, p. 248.

² Cf. n. 2, p. 250.

Sosistratos is dated in 282/281 for the following reasons: The prosopographical evidence demands as early a date for him as possible.¹ His name can be restored in *IG*, II², 672. This inscription must be dated in 282/281: first, because the college *οἱ ἐπὶ τῇ διοίκησει* existed during the democratic government from 288/287–280/279 or from 267/266–262/261; there is only one vacancy to which we can assign this decree, 282/281; secondly, the friendly relations between Athens and Lemnos, as those between Athens and Tenos (*IG*, II, 660), must have ended in 280/279 when Athens went over to Antigonos Gonatas and Ptolemy consolidated his power in the Aegean.² It is, therefore, impossible to assign this decree to 279/278, but it must be dated between 288 and 280. The only name of an archon which can be restored in this period is that of Sosistratos, who is thus definitely dated in 282/281.

¹ Cf. Ferguson, *Athenian Archons*, 37.

² Cf. Tarn, *op. cit.*, 106 ff., 418. There are difficulties in the way of dating *IG*, II², 672, in this period which must not be ignored. Athens could not be on good terms with Seleukos and Lysimachos at the same time. The true interpretation is probably as follows: When the Athenians first revolted from Demetrios, they turned naturally to Lysimachos; for he had sheltered their leading democrats and had generously responded to their embassies which came to beg for help. We have no evidence that these good relations lasted until 282 or even later than 284. There is nothing to prove that Athens was on the side of Lysimachos at Kouropedion. Apparently they sought to come to an understanding with Seleukos when their enemy Demetrios came into his hands. At least this gives a motive for their friendship. We may assume that when Seleukos definitely began to make his plan for the throne of Macedon, which he seems to have formulated after the murder of Agathokles by his father, Lemnos, which had belonged to Lysimachos, sharing the general revulsion against the king, revolted and sought help from Seleukos. Komeas, who was hipparch of the Athenian kleruchy on the island, not only shared the sentiments of the rest of the island but apparently went with an embassy, or alone, to the court of Seleukos to get assistance. He was cordially received, and through the help given, the island won its freedom. The story in *Athenaios* (vi. 254 ff.), told by Phylarchos, that the islanders were suffering untold abuses when freed from Lysimachos by Seleukos, may perhaps be taken *cum grano salis*. There is no doubt, however, that their gratitude was genuine even if excessive. It is not likely that Athens was any exception in sharing the worldwide sentiment against Lysimachos (Memnon, *FHG*, III, 532; cf. Tarn, *op. cit.*, 123, and n. 23, where other references are given). If so, she deserted him and cast in her lot with Seleukos, perhaps believing that her ancient possessions in the Aegean might some day be regained.

The inscription seems to refer to Seleukos as still alive. If so, the inscription cannot be later than 281. Kirchner's date in the late spring of 278 seems impossible, first, because the islands were Ptolemaic at that time (Tarn, *op. cit.*, 418); secondly, because during the years 279–268 the cost of inscriptions was not paid by a college but by a single officer in charge of the administration.

Euboulos can be placed only in the year 276/275, since all the other first years of an Olympiad are filled according to our cycle.

The archons *λαιος* and Telokles must be dated before the death of Epicurus and probably as early as possible. I date *λαιος* in 277/276 and Telokles in 275/274. Thymochares, who follows an archon with ten letters in the genitive of his name (*IG*, II², 700), should be placed immediately after Telokles in 274/273. The proper restoration of *IG*, II², 700, lines 2–3, is probably as follows:

[Boη-]

[δ]ρομῶνος ἐνὶ καὶ [νέαι πέμπτει καὶ εἰκοστῇ τῆς πρυτανείας].

The inscription is written *stoichedon*, and each line has 50 letters. The date of the decree is the thirtieth or twenty-ninth of Boedromion. The only possible restorations in line 3 which give 50 letters are ἐβδόμει καὶ εἰκοστῇ, πέμπτει καὶ εἰκοστῇ or τετάρτει καὶ δεκάτει. Of these the second only can be explained, and in an intercalary year the thirtieth of Boedromion falls on the twenty-fifth day of the third prytany.¹ Therefore, the year of Thymochares is intercalary, and he cannot be placed in 269/268, for in that case two intercalary years come together. Therefore, Thymochares must be placed in 274/273. The only alternative is to date this archon after Demokles, but the letters of Epicurus are probably, though not necessarily, to be dated as early as possible.

The archon Polyeuktos is dated by our secretary-cycle in 273/272 and we infer from *IG*, II², 680, that the Soteiria at Delphi were celebrated for the first time in 272/271. We now have available all the evidence which Pomtow promised to bring forward to prove that the Soteiria were celebrated in 276/275.² His chief argument still depends upon the Sotion funeral inscription. Sotion died in the ninth year of a Ptolemy while announcing the Soteiria in Egypt as an ambassador from Delphi. The objections to dating Sotion's death in 277/276 are all stated by Ferguson,³ and we have nothing new to add. Even if Pomtow is right in dating his death in 277/276, it does not follow that the games were celebrated in the following year.

¹ Schmidt, *Handbuch der griechischen Chronologie*, 774–75.

² Pomtow, *BPW* (1910), 1087–96; *GGA* (1913), 178 ff.

³ *Hellenistic Athens*, 164, n. 1; see especially Pagenstecher, *AJA* (1909), 414 ff.

This may have been only a preliminary embassy to sound the Ptolemies and the East on the question of sharing pan-Hellenic games to be celebrated later. Even in our own day, with vastly improved methods of communication, the Olympic games are not decided upon and arranged for in a single year. It is impossible that the pan-Hellenic Soteiria could have been arranged for in a few months, except perhaps in the case of a few neighboring states, even though they had the machinery of the Pythian games to fall back upon.

In dating the archon Kraton in 277/276, Pomtow is begging the question, and he can be justified only if the evidence of the Sotion inscription proves that the Soteiria were actually celebrated in 276/275 or that Athens participated in that year. The history of this period is too obscure for one to speak decisively on the matter. Athens was certainly under pro-Macedonian government at this time, and therefore at least semi-dependent on Antigonos. The relations of the latter with the Aetolians may have prevented Athens from sharing in the games in 276/275 if they were established then. At any rate, it may be noted that Athens did not apparently take part in the Amphiktyonic Council in 276/275. Nor does the fact that Kybernis received *προξενία* in Kraton's year prove necessarily that Kraton and Polyeuktos are contemporary. It proves rather that Kraton follows Polyeuktos and should be identified with Hieron. In Hieron's archonship Athens was doing her best to display her loyalty to Antigonos, and if she was in the same state of mind when she participated in the Soteiria we may be able to prove that Antigonos and Aetolia were on friendly terms in 273/272.

Pomtow is undoubtedly right when he observes that the celebration of the Pythia and the Soteiria together would have dimmed the luster of the new games, but we see no objection to placing these for the first time in 272/271. At any rate, Athenian citizens did not take part in them until that year, if we can trust the evidence of the secretary-cycle. It is possible also that the games were quadrennial at first and were celebrated midway between the Pythia.¹

¹ This is open to question if we see fit to reject Pomtow's dates for the Delphic archons (see p. 272). The annual performances may have begun at the very first, and this would be our natural inference if we found good evidence that annual Soteiria were celebrated *ca.* 268. So far as I can determine, there is no evidence to prove that the games were quadrennial at first. If they were annual, they *may* have been instituted

Philoneos may be dated in 270/269 or 269/268; this is determined mainly by the prosopographical evidence.¹ Moreover, the officer in charge of the administration (ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει) pays for the decree in the year following. This shows that Philoneos must be dated between 279 and 268 or between 262 and 231. The restoration of his name in *IG*, II², 702, 703, is excluded because the college οἱ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει pays the cost of the decree in the year following. The year 269/268 is assigned to a secretary from Aiantis in the reconstructed cycle. In my opinion the archon Theophilos² (*IG*, II⁵, 381b), whose secretary comes from Aphidna, must be dated in this year. The form of the letters in this decree belongs to the first half of the century. It is possible that we should restore ἐπὶ Ἀγασίου in *IG*, II², 702, 703, since this name fills the lacuna and apparently the archon Agasias belongs to the early part of the third century.³

Peithidemos must be placed in 267/266, and the literary evidence favors this date rather than the year following, to which he has usually been assigned.⁴ The beginning of the Chremonidean war is thus placed in the fall of 267/266, and the first campaign begins in the following spring. This date agrees best with the literary evidence concerning the death of Areus.

Some disturbance in the secretary-cycle might have been expected at the outbreak of the Chremonidean war, especially as it chanced that Antigonis would naturally hold the secretaryship in that year.⁵

as early as 275, not much earlier, because it was only in 276 that Antigonos gained his brilliant victory at Lysimacheia (Philodemos; cf. Mayer, *Philologus*, LXXI, 226 ff.) and freed Greece from danger. Strained relations between Antigonos and Aetolia may have prevented Athens from participating, but I still think from the wording of *IG*, II², 680, that the games were not held before the archonship of Hieron in 272/271.

¹ See Ferguson and Kolbe (see n. 2, p. 248). Kirchner dates Philoneos after 256, but it seems to me well-nigh impossible that the same man should have served as *paidotribes* from 281/280 until after 256. Moreover, it is doubtful if the ephebic system was followed from 260 to 240. At least we have no ephebic decrees from that period.

² I had accepted Roussell's dating (cf. *AJP* [1913], 417), with some misgivings because of the division of the deme between Ptolemais and Aiantis. The problem is happily solved by the present rearrangement of the cycle.

³ Ferguson, *Athenian Archons*, 35.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 28.

⁵ The elections may have been held before the war party had definitely formulated its plan or gained control of the government. At any rate, the alliance with Sparta was too late for a campaign that year. Apparently no change was made in the secretary-cycle. Only the administration officer was removed and replaced by a board.

If, however, we are correct in placing Philokrates¹ in 266/265, it is evident that the two Macedonian tribes were not dropped from the cycle, and naturally under democratic leadership no other disturbance would be expected.

The date of Philokrates is an interesting problem. Here is the evidence: According to Philodemos, the philosopher Polemon died in the archonship of Philokrates (τὸν Πολέμωνα κατὰ Φιλοκράτην ἐγλιπεῖν τὸν βίον). Eusebios, according to one manuscript tradition, places the death of this philosopher in 268/267 and that of Zeno in 264/263, but according to another these dates are 270/269 and 266/265 respectively. Since there is not the slightest doubt that Zeno died in 262/261,² it is probable that a complete Olympiad has dropped out of the reckoning in the manuscript of Eusebios. We are therefore justified in dating Philokrates in 266/265, four years before the death of Zeno as Eusebios places it. This happens to be the date in which our reconstructed cycle places this archon, and there can be very little doubt that this is correct.

The cycle as it is now constructed depends solely upon the secretaries of Diokles and Philokrates for its continuity during the early third century. If the dates of these archons are established and if the cycle is found to correspond with these dates, there can be little doubt that the cycle was followed without a break through these years. Let us consider the situation if there is a break. During the years 288–280, when the democracy was untrammelled, any disturbance of the cycle is unlikely. Between 280 and 272, when Athens was under Antigonos, we might expect that the democratic forms were less consistently followed. It is quite evident from the decrees in the archonships of Polyeuktos and Hieron that the secretary-cycle was followed in those two years, and we may judge from the record of Phaidros that under his leadership none of the usual forms of democracy would be abrogated. Moreover, if we place Polyeuktos in 277/276 and Hieron in 276/275, then . . . *λαῖος* must be placed in 275/274 and Telokles in 274/73. Thymochares undoubtedly follows Telokles and we should be forced to place Eu-

¹ Schoene, *Eusebios*, ii. 121, M, gives Ol. 127, 2; APF, Ol. 127, 3; R, 127, 4; the others, Ol. 128, 1. The Armenian version gives Ol. 126, 3 or 4; cf. Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik*, 343; Mayer, *op. cit.*, 227 ff.

² This is universally accepted; see Mayer, *Philologus*, LXXI, 226 ff. and 233 ff.

boulos in 272/271, when Athens would be strongly pro-Macedonian, while at the same time, according to this theory, she would be represented in the Amphiktyonic Council, a manifest impossibility. By this *reductio ad absurdum* Pomtow's date for Polyeuktos must be rejected, and we shall have to reconcile ourselves to dating this archon in the year 273/272.

The archon for the year 265/264 may be found in *IG*, II², 689. This . . . *ἰδης* cannot be identified with Arrheneides since the board, *οἱ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει*, pays for the decree in the archonship of the former, while under Arrheneides in the Macedonian régime the single officer, *ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει*, is found. The college controlling the administration is found only in the years 288–280 and 268–262. The only vacancy in these years for *IG*, II², 689 is 265/264. Because of the plural board which pays for inscriptions under the archonship of Glaukippos, and for prosopographical reasons, Glaukippos must be dated in the time of the Chremonidean war. The secretary-cycle enables us to date this archon in the year 263/262. In the year 262/261 the Chremonidean war came to an end, and Antigonos became master of Athens. New officers were appointed in charge of the government, and the archons as well as the priests of Asklepios were changed. The secretary-cycle was broken, the new secretary was appointed from the tribe Antigonis, and the cycle was carried on to the end of the century without a break.

Some of the historical problems which have hitherto proved most vexing are happily solved by this arrangement of the cycle. Some new problems, however, are raised, and much of the detail of Athenian history between 294 and 262 will need to be revised if this cycle is found to stand the test of criticism. A summary of the most important points involved may be briefly stated. After the fall of Lachares there followed a period when the ultra-oligarchs controlled the state with small regard to the old democracy.¹ Apparently the

¹ For the history of this period in greater detail I refer to the standard works of Niese, Beloch, Ferguson, and Tarn, and especially the last three. I do not agree with Ferguson in his analysis of the situation at Athens following the fall of Lachares. There is no evidence that the archon Olympiodoros was the eager democrat of the fourth century who was found serving the democracy again in 288–280. The decree of Stratokles in honor of Philippides does not prove that there is a coalition of parties. It may only be the reward to Philippides (who, if he was a supporter of Lachares, was no ardent democrat, and may have found slight difficulty in supporting Demetrios)

secretary-cycle was abandoned for a time, although the machinery of government was still kept up in some measure. In the archonship of Kimon, Phaidros, a pro-Macedonian of more moderate tendencies, gained the confidence of Demetrios and succeeded in having the older forms of popular government restored.¹ Demetrios lost control of Athens in 289/288, and the city was free until early in the year 279. Peiraeus remained in the hands of Antigonos, however,² and the importation of grain by sea was hampered, although we know that Egypt sent grain in the archonship of Diokles safeguarded by the fleet of Ptolemaios. These ships may have landed at Sunion. It is not certain that Antigonos sought continuously from 288 until 279 to regain Athens. Most likely he did not, for his money chest was empty and he could levy neither men nor taxes. He may have permitted grain to enter the port and have secured some revenue in that way. It is probable that truce was often declared; we infer that the city or country was not under siege in 285/284, because in the decrees of that year no mention is made of sacrifices for safety, which were always offered when the enemies' forces were in the country.³

On the abdication of Demetrios in 286/285, Antigonos assumed the title of king, but it was purely nominal as far as his claim to Macedon was concerned, and he wrote to this effect to Zeno.⁴ The story of the next three years must still be written, for evidence

for coming over to the winning side. Phaidros did not become general until 292/291. The general amnesty in 294/293 (Dion. Hal. *Deinarchos* 9) did not extend to the democrats of the type of Demochares, though it brought back Deinarchos, a pro-Kassander man. It is not proved that there was a coalition or moderate party at any time before Phaidros, in the archonship of Kimon, who won back a measure of democracy. The disturbance of the secretary-cycle is proof of my point as well as the reference to the "hard times" in *IG*, II², 682 (Ferguson, *Klio* [1905], 155-79; *Hellenistic Athens*, 136 ff.; Tarn, *op. cit.*, 44).

¹ *IG*, II², 650.

² I cannot see any good reason for assuming that he ever lost this important post. The passage in Pausanias i. 26. 3 may possibly refer to the recovery of the harbors after the battle of Ipsos. There is nothing to indicate that this exploit of Olympiodoros must be connected with the years 288-280. The passage should be translated as follows: "This exploit of Olympiodoros [i.e., the recovery of the Mouseion] is his greatest, if we do not consider what he *did* when he recovered Peiraeus and Mounichia" (cf. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, 145, 152, n. 4).

³ *IG*, II², 657, though this is not clear. This decree does indicate, however, that Athens was taking or preparing to take the offensive in recovering Peiraeus. She could not, therefore, have been worried much by an invading army.

⁴ Mayer, *op. cit.*, 226 ff.

is lacking about all the intrigues and counter-intrigues of Lysimachos, Seleukos, Antigonos, and Pyrrhos; nor do we know just what part Athens played in this game. We seem to find her deserting Lysimachos in 282/281 and negotiating with Seleukos, but the only document which deals with the subject is fragmentary and its interpretation is not definitely determined.¹ From Philodemos we learn that someone prevented Antigonos from getting a united kingdom; this "someone" may be Pyrrhos, Ptolemaios, Lysimachos, or Seleukos, but most likely the last.²

On the death of Lysimachos in 281, which was speedily followed by the murder of Seleukos, Antigonos determined to contest Keraunos' claim to the throne of Macedon. The fleet which he gathered was met at sea and totally defeated.³ Antigonos withdrew to Boeotia, which still apparently remained loyal; there he made his headquarters for his land campaign against Athens. Meanwhile the Aetolians, his allies, had beaten back an incursion of the Spartans and their allies, who had revolted on the news of Antigonos' defeat.⁴ When Sparta sought to stir up her allies to take revenge on Aetolia, they refused, since they were suspicious of her motives; so the war against Antigonos was not pressed. It might have been disastrous to him if they had renewed the war, but his possession of Corinth helped to dampen the eagerness of the Peloponnesian allies for any offensive campaign.

From Boeotia and the Peiraeus Antigonos maintained an effectual blockade of Athens. That the city was troubled is shown by the fact that sacrifices for safety were offered in the month Anthesterion in 280, and in the following autumn sacrifices to Dionysos were made for the fruits in the field, the grape, and the olive.⁵ The inference is

¹ *IG*, II², 672; Hesychios, *s.v.* *δύνασαι σιωπᾶν*; see n. 2, p. 258. The secret agreement between Antigonos and Pyrrhos undoubtedly belongs here. It probably gave Antigonos a free hand in Macedon, if the latter would support Pyrrhos in his search for a western kingdom. See next note.

² Mayer, *loc. cit.*, 226. I prefer to think that Seleukos was the culprit, especially if Athens had made an alliance with him (cf. n. 2, p. 258).

³ Memnon, *FHG*, 534. If the text of Memnon is correct, the relations of Antigonos and Boeotia must either be that of a friendly alliance, or else Boeotia was subject. A few years later Boeotia was independent, as her vote in the Amphiktyonic Council shows.

⁴ Justin xxiv. 1.

⁵ *IG*, II², 661, 668.

plain. Athens was beset by an invading land army, but Antigonos though king was without a kingdom, and, greater hardship still, without an income; so the blockade or siege could not be pressed very vigorously. He resolved on a stratagem, and making a truce with Athens early in the fall he withdrew his forces.¹ The Athenians sowed their grain, reserving barely enough to last until harvest, but in the spring Antigonos suddenly returned, and, getting possession of the harvest fields, had the city at his mercy. The Athenians surrendered rather than starve, and their submission probably gave them easier terms than they otherwise might have had.² The moderate pro-Antigonid Phaidros and his party were elected to office immediately, and Phaidros was able to celebrate certain *agones*, probably the Panathenaia, with unusual splendor.³

The invasion of the Gauls now becomes the central theme of Greek history. The first onset came in the archonship of Anaxikrates in 279/278.⁴ Keraunos faced the invading hosts but was defeated and slain.⁵ The Gauls met with only a feeble resistance, plundered the land of Macedon to their hearts' content, and withdrew. The throne of Macedon was vacant, with two claimants, Antigonos and Antiochos. Antiochos had with difficulty obtained the kingdom of his father, and was still involved in wars over some portions of it. He could not press his claim in person, but sent his general Patrokles,

¹ Athens was untroubled from September to December as we infer from *IG*, II², 665, 666, 667.

² Polyaeos iv. 6. 20. I do not see how the account of Polyaeos can possibly be fitted into any other occasion. The surrender of the city comes in February or March, when the grain supply was low and the harvest still two or three months off. In the Chremonidean war the city surrendered in September. This account seems to prove also that the Peiraeus was in the hands of Antigonos. Otherwise the starvation of the people would not have been such a simple matter.

³ *IG*, II², 682.

⁴ Pausanias x. 23. 14; Justin xxiv. 4 ff. Keraunos was king one year and five months (*FHG*, III, 699), and probably about seven months elapsed after the battle of Koroupedion before he became king (Just. xvii. 2). Keraunos was killed in the first invasion of the Gauls in the summer of 279.

The account of Pausanias in reference to the Gallic invasion is, in general, the one which I have chosen to follow. Most of the evidence and literature which bears on the subject of the invasion is cited by Stähelin, *Geschichte der kleinasiatischen Galater* (1907), 1-6 and notes. Important contributions since 1907 are cited in the following notes. The fragment of Philodemos is particularly important; see Mayer, *loc. cit.*

⁵ Memnon xiv-xviii; Justin xxiv. 4-5; Trogus, Prologos, xxiv; Tarn, *op. cit.*, 139-66.

who, however, became involved in trouble with the Bithynians and was ambushed and slain. Antiochos determined, therefore, to march first against the Bithynians, who accordingly ranged themselves on the side of Antigonos. Before Antigonos and Antiochos met, the latter had to face and reduce the Bithynians; for the empire in Asia might be endangered if he crossed over to Europe. But neither army was strong enough to take the offensive, and after a while the armies dispersed without striking a blow.¹ It is probable that a truce was at the same time concluded between Antigonos and Antiochos by which the spheres of each were limited to Europe and Asia respectively. At any rate Antigonos entered into his inheritance, even if only a part of it acknowledged him, and in the archonship of Anaxikrates he was able to write that he was now king of Macedon in fact as well as in name.²

But his triumph was momentary; for the second invasion of the Gauls under Brennos swept over Macedon in 278 and Antigonos was

¹ Memnon xv-xviii; Justin xxv. 1.

² Memnon, xiv; Philodemos, *op. cit.* I think Mayer has entirely misinterpreted the fragment of Philodemos. The truce referred to was that concluded between Antiochos and Antigonos by which the sphere of influence of each was delimited (cf. Tarn, *op. cit.*, 168). Mayer has not given us any indication of the clearness of the letters which he sees, and he may be correct in reading the papyrus in line 4, but no Greek ever wrote the form [Λακὸ]νων for Λακόνων. Mayer makes no comment on the curious form, but I suspect that the proper reading of this line is καὶ [Μακ<εδ>δ]νων. It is evident that Antigonos was not driven out "again" or "back" into Asia, if he had not in some way gained a foothold in Macedon. Mayer is incorrect in bringing the Justin passage (xxiv. 1) into relation with his reading, for it is apparent from Justin that Antigonos had no part in the fighting, which took place only between Aetolians and Spartans with probably a few allies. Antigonos was driven out by the second inroad of the Gauls and retired to Asia. If Asia were hostile, he would have withdrawn to the south and shared in the defense of Thermopylae, but his crossing over to Asia is proof that he and Antiochos were on good terms. On the Asia Minor side, probably at Abydos with its harbor for his fleet, he watched the course of events across the strait. Evidently in 276 he saw an opportunity to strike. The battle of Lysimacheia closes the story of the Gallic invasion. Antigonos, then, was king of Macedon in 279/278 and he wrote to this effect to his friend Zeno. It is evident that this is the content of that letter if it balances and contrasts the one five years earlier. The two different traditions about the accession of Antigonos are now explained. He was actually king in 279/278—how long we do not know but assuredly not more than a month or two. After the death of Keraunos and the adjustment with Antiochos, very little time elapsed before the second invasion in the spring. The second accession came in 276. For the extraordinary confusion of the accounts of the accession, which was probably caused by mixing up the real facts and not less by corruption of the MSS, see Müller, *FHG*, III, 698-701, and Müller's notes *ad. loc.*

forced to retire to Asia; however, some of the walled towns near the coast remained in his possession, since the Gauls were not prepared for siegeworks. The fact that he retired to Asia is proof of the good-will of Antiochos,¹ for with his weakened forces, he would have been an easy prey if Antiochos were still an enemy. Another slight proof of their agreement is that each sent the same number of mercenaries to the defense of Thermopylae.²

The second invasion of the Gauls came in the spring of 278. The raid on Delphi came in the spring of the year. The snowstorm episode does not necessarily imply a fall campaign, for Delphian weather is no better than our own. The Greek historians marvel at the storm, and apparently it must have been more wonderful to them than to the Gauls, who were northerners. There would have been nothing unusual in an autumnal snowfall, but in the month of May it would have surprised the Delphians. Such weather, however, is not impossible. After Demetrios came to Athens, the crops, not only the grain but also the grapevines and figs, were damaged by the severe weather.³ The leading arguments which induce us to date the raid in the spring are as follows: There was plenty of good wine all through the country, and the Gauls enjoyed it, resined or not. In the fall, before or after the gathering of the grapes, there would be barely enough of the old wine to last through the winter, certainly not enough to intoxicate 65,000 Gauls who took their wine unmixed, while in the spring the new vintage would be ready. The argument is not conclusive but nevertheless cannot be disregarded, and Justin enlarges upon the wine-drinking as a vital point.⁴ What is more important still, the Koans hear the news and send their embassy to Delphi in the month Panomos, or September.⁵ Would they have waited a whole year to offer their sacrifices of thanksgiving? This seems most unlikely, and the embassy went in September shortly after they heard the news of the victory. The rout

¹ Philodemos; Mayer, *loc. cit.*

² Pausanias x. 20. 5.

³ Plutarch *Demetrios* xii: καὶ πάχνης βαθείας ἐπιπεσούσης οὐ μόνον ἀμπελούς καὶ συκᾶς ἀπάσας ἀπέκασε τὸ ψῦχος ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ σίτου τὸ πλεῖστον κατέφθειρεν ἐν χλδῳ, and see the verses of Philippides cited by Plutarch *ibid.*

⁴ Justin xxiv. 7. 4-9; 8. 1. It should also be noted that the oracle had warned the natives not to carry away their *harvested crop* (*messes* is the word used). This also supports the view taken in the text, though it need not be pressed.

⁵ Herzog, *C. R. Acad. Inscr.* (1904), 165 ff.

of the Gauls at Thermopylae followed soon after the raid on Delphi. We may assume from Pausanias that this occurred in the archonship of Demokles, whose year might begin as early as May 31.¹ Although the Gauls were routed, all danger and all apprehension had not passed away, for the Koans added instructions for their embassy to perform sacrifices for *safety* as well as for thanksgiving.

The story of the defeat does not concern us here. But it should be remarked that if Athens and Boeotia sent contingents, they were not, therefore, necessarily independent. If the barbarians were not checked, the south of Greece, at least as far as the Isthmus, was doomed whether the cities were free or whether they were subject to Macedon. Antigonos was not in a position to defend Athens, and we cannot believe that he refused to allow her to defend herself. This she did, and probably the account in Pausanias is partly right, for if she had no ships of her own to send, she may have helped to man those of Antigonos in the harbor. The question of independence was not a vital one at this crisis. The danger of subjection to the barbarian was a vital matter; consequently they left the question of independence until later. After the Gauls were repulsed, Boeotia became independent,² but there is no evidence that Athens made any move to recover her freedom. The reason is not far to seek. Antigonos controlled the harbor, and if he still controlled the Hellespontine towns and trade route, he controlled the grain supply. This fact combined with the wise and moderate rule of Phaidros checked any tendency to revolt. Moreover, Aetolia got most of the credit of defeating the Gauls, and the minor part played by Athens did not stir up the national consciousness so much as when she won Marathon and Salamis.

Even after the defeat of the Gauls at Delphi and their retreat northward the cloud of danger still hung over Greece, but more

¹ Ferguson, *Cl. Phil.*, III (1908), 386, shows that the year 322 began on May 31. Two ordinary years preceded it. Apparently we have the same conditions in 278.

² Inference from the Amphiktyonic votes in Hieron's year (*IG*, II, 551). Tarn is not justified in stating that Boeotia revolted with the rest of Greece in the uprising after his defeat at sea. Memnon only says that Antigonos retired to Boeotia, and his land campaign against Athens in 280 and 279 must have been carried on from there. Boeotia apparently gained independence only after the defeat of the Gauls at Thermopylae. As a self-supporting state and without much sea commerce, she could more easily than Athens assert her independence of Antigonos (Tarn, *op. cit.*, 132, n. 44).

particularly over Macedon, which was still occupied by roving bands of the barbarians. It was not until 276 that Antigonos by brilliant strategy won a decisive and crushing victory at Lysimacheia, which not only disheartened the Gauls but enormously enhanced the prestige of the victor and brought him back once more to the throne of Macedon.¹

The question of the reorganization of Macedon does not concern us here, but we turn to determine the relations of Macedon to Athens for the years 278–268. As we have already indicated, we believe that Athens remained loyal to Antigonos. The decree in honor of Phaidros shows that the city was pro-Macedonian in 279 and in 276. If Athens had become independent, it would have been after the defeat of the Gauls in 278, and if so, she would have sent a representative to the Amphiktyonic Council; it is evident, however, that none was sent. It is difficult to see how Antigonos could have recovered Athens before Macedon if the former had revolted. All these considerations confirm our belief that Athens did not take advantage of her opportunity, which after all was not particularly favorable for secession.

The history of the years following Antigonos' accession to the throne in 276 are extraordinarily obscure as far as Athens is concerned. The Athenians were loyal enough in 275 and probably the relations of the king and the Athenians were most cordial.² In fact Athens appears to have been his intellectual capital, and the reins of authority were lightly held.³ The king held Euboea, Peiraeus, and Corinth, and with these secure he cared little for the rest of Greece.

¹ Justin xxv. 1. 2; Diogenes Laertios ii. 141–42. The date is inferred from Philodemos (Mayer, *loc. cit.*). See Tarn, *op. cit.*, 164–66, and Appendix VI. Justin (xxv. 1) has confused the accounts. Antigonos had been reconciled with Antiochos in 279/278, and when driven out of Macedon received an asylum in Asia.

² The decree for Phaidros proves this. I am inclined to think that there was a short period of universal good-will after the defeat of the Gauls, especially if the fragment of Alexis (244, Koch, II, p. 386) means by *ὁμολογία* an *entente cordiale* between Athens and Egypt (cf. Ferguson, *Hell. Ath.*, 171). Lehmann-Haupt (*Klio* [1905], 375 ff.) tries to prove that Ptolemy and Antigonos were friends prior to 274 B.C. His arguments are effectually answered by Tarn, *op. cit.*, 443–45, but in spite of Tarn's arguments there is no objection against *ὁμολογία* for a short time ca. 276–75.

³ See particularly Tarn, *op. cit.*, chap. viii. I think that Tarn paints the picture somewhat too brightly.

No attempt seems to have been made to recover Boeotia. The problem of reorganization at home was sufficient to take all his energies. In this he was suddenly checked by the return of Pyrrhos from Italy, who made himself master of Macedon with extraordinary swiftness. Antigonos was once more forced from his throne, but thanks to the loyalty of a few of the coast towns and the fickleness of Pyrrhos, his exile was brief.¹ But the effect of his defeat on the rest of Greece was bad. Most of the states hastened to send envoys to Pyrrhos, welcoming him as their liberator or inviting him to enter in that capacity. Athens sent envoys along with the rest, but it may well be doubted whether this fact means that Athens had openly rejected the supporters of Phaidros.² I am inclined to think that the embassy came from the Nationalist party, inviting Pyrrhos to come and help them to get control of the government, which was still Macedonian. There is, however, not enough evidence to decide the point. Athens could not have shaken off the power of Macedon without being sure of a grain supply other than that which came through the Hellespont, and undoubtedly the Nationalist party had some understanding with Egypt. Pyrrhos may even have been subsidized with Egyptian gold.³ Whether the embassy from Athens was official or not, it received scant attention from Pyrrhos. Perhaps he realized that the harbor could not be recovered without an expensive and tedious siege for which he had little heart, and no equipment, either by land or sea, for successfully carrying on such operations. Besides, he saw a more brilliant opening in Sparta; hence Athens was passed by.

Pyrrhos made the greatest strategic mistake of his life in leaving Macedon without consolidating his conquests. Antigonos recovered his lost kingdom even more quickly than he had lost it, and was able to follow Pyrrhos to Sparta shortly afterward. If Athens had revolted, she must have hastened to return to the fold, for when the Lesser Mysteries were celebrated in the spring of 272, sacrifices were offered for the welfare of King Antigonos, and the decree praising

¹ Plutarch *Pyrrhos* 26 ff.; Justin xxv. 3 ff.; cf. Tarn, *op. cit.*, 260, n. 7. I think that Tarn's chronology happens to be correct, though his argument from *IG*, II, 5, 323b, can no longer hold.

² Justin *loc. cit.*

³ Tarn, *op. cit.*, 264.

the officers in charge of the sacrifices was passed in January, 271.¹ There is not much doubt that Athens was loyal to Antigonos throughout.

We are now brought face to face with a difficult situation; for, according to the accepted dates of the Delphic archons, Athens sent a representative to the Amphiktyonic Council in the years 273-271.² If this is correct, Athens must either have been free from Antigonos during these years or else there must have been some inexplicable understanding between Antigonos and Aetolia by which Athens and Euboea were permitted to share in the council.

Let us consider the dates of these Delphic archons. If Archiadas is correctly placed in 273, we must assume that Athens was already independent in the spring of 274/273, and long enough before that to arrange for her part in the spring meeting. While this is possible, it is hard to believe; for it is evident that Athens did not seek to communicate with Pyrrhos until he reached the Chersonese in the autumn of 273.³

The archon Eudokos cannot be dated in 272 because sacrifices were offered in that year for Antigonos, which shows that the city even if it had revolted at the news of Pyrrhos' success in Macedon, had speedily returned to her allegiance. But it does not seem possible that the city had actually overturned the Phaidros government, and certainly Athens could not be sacrificing to Antigonos and sending a *hieromnemon* to the council at the same time.⁴

In the archonship of Straton, an Argive named Eudoxos promised and gave ten shields for the gymnastic contest at the Pythia. This decree cannot precede the Pythian games; for it is certain that no legislative body on earth would decree its highest gifts in return for mere promises.⁵ The archonship of Straton must, therefore, be coincident with or immediately follow the Pythia. Moreover, in 271 Argos was certainly pro-Antigonid, and the good relations

¹ *IG*, II², 683.

² Pomtow, *Jahrb. f. cl. Phil.* (1894), 517-23, 826 ff.; *GGA* (1913), 145 ff.; Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, III, 2, 322 ff.

³ So Justin *loc. cit.*

⁴ So Beloch, *loc. cit.*; see also Tarn, *op. cit.*, 212 ff.

⁵ Beloch was forced to this assumption by other considerations which are no longer effective.

existing between Argos and the Amphiktyonic Council indicated in the decree are more than questionable at this time.

The Euboean (Eretrian) votes at the Pylaia during the years 273–271 are deserving of consideration. Is there any real evidence that Eretria was free? There are two accounts diametrically opposed.¹ Which are we to follow? According to one, Eretria was free in 276, when Antigonos defeated the Gauls at Lysimacheia, and Menedemos drafted a decree of congratulations which made the city suspect that he was seeking to hand over the city to Antigonos. He was forced into exile and took refuge at Oropos, where he was hunted out by Boeotia on the charge of stealing some gold cups from the sanctuary. He made his way secretly back to Eretria and, taking his wife and family, fled to Macedon, where he died. There is little doubt of the falsity of this story, for Menedemos could hardly have dared to move such a decree, no matter how carefully worded, in a state which had recently freed itself from Antigonos; and the story of the persecution of the aged philosopher is ridiculous. Against this account is set the other, which is supported by Herakleides, Antigonos of Karystos, and Diogenes Laertios himself. According to their version, the story which we have just given is pure calumny. Menedemos had always opposed those who wished to bring in the tyrants, apparently in 294, when the island came under Demetrios. He could not, therefore, be accused of betraying his city to Antigonos. As a matter of fact, he went to the court of the king after his victory over the Gauls, to secure the independence of his country. Antigonos refused, though he wished to grant the request of his friend and teacher, but Persaios dissuaded him, and his own practical mind perceived the wisdom of Persaios' advice. Menedemos was so grieved at his failure that he ended his life by abstaining from food.

The evidence is overwhelmingly in favor of our contention that Euboea was subject to Antigonos throughout the years 276–271, unless we believe that Eretria succeeded in ejecting the Macedonian

¹ Diogenes Laertios ii. 141 ff. The story told in section 127 has always been brought into connection with this, apparently because the Amphiaraon at Peiraeus was confused with that in Oropos, but the story there told took place in that sanctuary in Peiraeus and seems to refer to 295/294. If I understand the conversation it does not seem appropriate to 274 when Hierokles was no longer a tender lad.

garrison on hearing of the success of Pyrrhos; but there is absolutely nothing to prove such a theory. Euboea, therefore, did not send *hieromnemones* to the Amphiktyonic Council in 274-271.

The Delphic archons Archiadas, Eudokos, and Straton cannot possibly belong to the years 274-271. They must be dated along with Damaios and Damosthenes in some period when Athens and Euboea were free. This group of five archons might be fitted into the years of the Chremonidean war from 267 to 262, if Euboea was one of the allies of Athens during that war, but it is impossible to date the Delphian archons until all the unpublished material is made available to scholars.¹ It is clear, however, that the dates of the archons which are at present given for the third century must be revised.

We may now return to the history of Athens. There is no evidence that the city repudiated the pro-Antigonid government on the news of Pyrrhos' successes in Macedon. An embassy was sent to the latter, but this was from the Nationalists, who sought the aid of Pyrrhos to help them establish themselves. Apparently they met

¹ This group might be placed after 232 when Athens was free and Euboea apparently independent, if it were not for the Sicyonian vote. Euboea was allied with Philip after 224 (Polybios xi. 5), and later subject to Macedon (Polybios xviii. 46. 5). Hence we can hardly date these decrees after 224. As far as I can determine from the evidence of the published documents, there is no objection to be urged against the period of the Chremonidean war for these archons. If so, we have proof that Eretria was allied with Athens. It is not necessary to assume that Chalkis was independent also and allied with Athens. At least there seems no reason for assuming that the Euboean votes mean those of Chalkis. This point needs further investigation. Usually the names of the Euboean *hieromnemones* are given without any descriptive epithet to determine where they came from. The only exception is *SGDI*, 2517 (archon Straton), where we have recorded Εὐβοέων Ἀμφικράτους Χαλκίως. Does the insertion of the adjective mean that Amphikrates was elected by Chalkis as their deputy? If so, we must assume that Chalkis was independent in the archonship of Straton. In view of the fact that the use of the adjective is unusual I prefer to believe that Amphikrates was elected by some other town which was independent, probabl Eretria.

Sikyon's vote in the Council requires a word of comment. Beloch (*Gr. Gesch.*, III, 179-81) places the death of Kleinias in 269 or 268. I think that Niese (*Gesch. der Gr. u. Mak. Staaten*, II, 243, 5) has interpreted the evidence more correctly, however. Beloch explains away the statement that Aratos was twenty years old when Sikyon recovered its independence (Polybios ii. 43. 3, *ἔτη μὲν ἔχων εἰκοσι*) by asserting that Polybios means approximately twenty-five years. This he was forced to do because of his dates for the Delphic archons. If Sikyon is not amongst the allies of Athens in the decree of Chremonides, we need not conclude that Sikyon did not or could not join the alliance in the following year. The revolution of Abantidas in 264, perhaps aided by Antigonos, brought the connection of Sikyon with the Amphiktyonic League to a speedy close.

with nothing better than promises; for Pyrrhos went on to win a bigger prize, Sparta. At the Lesser Mysteries in 272 the Athenians offered sacrifices for Antigonos, and we may be sure that the Nationalists had never gained control of the government in the interim. Some agreement had been made between Aetolia and Antigonos in the meantime, and a deputation came from them to Athens about April in 272 and was cordially received.¹ In January of the following year the managers of the Mysteries were publicly thanked for their care in performing the sacrifices.² Antigonos still controlled the city.

In 271/270 the decree honoring Demochares was passed.³ Demochares was a good democrat, and apparently no friend of Macedon; consequently historians have always assumed that the Nationalist party was in control in that year. This assumption was supported by the belief that Athens was represented in the Amphiktyonic Council in 271. The latter prop is gone; therefore let us examine the other. There is little doubt that Demochares had withdrawn from public life in 280 and very probably by 284, when he devoted himself to his history.⁴ He had always been a lover of democracy and never deserted her as long as he was in political life. If the decree proposed by Laches is studied, we notice a curious reserve in its wording. Evidently an effort is made to avoid any reference to Antigonos or to offend the king. Such a reserve would not be expected from the Nationalist party. But did Demochares spend his last years in Athens as an open enemy of Antigonos? Fortunately

¹ This is difficult. Tarn believes that Aetolia sympathized with Pyrrhos (Tarn, *op. cit.*, 266), but the statement that Pyrrhos went to the Peloponnese through Aetolia does not seem to me to be proved. He was at the Chersonese at the end of the previous campaign (Justin xxv. 4. 4), and it is not necessary to reach Megalopolis by way of Aetolia. I can find no other evidence for Tarn's claim, unless he considers that the Aetolian and Epeiroi coinage struck in Syracuse proves that Aetolia allowed Pyrrhos to pass through (*op. cit.*, 266, n. 24). I am inclined to think that Aetolia grew suspicious of Pyrrhos' motives after his astonishing successes, and deemed it expedient to come to a good understanding with Antigonos before the balance of power should become too much disturbed by the new designs of Pyrrhos in Southern Greece. Hence the embassy to Athens and its cordial reception.

² *IG*, II², 683.

³ Plutarch *Vitae X Oratorum* 851 D.

⁴ Inference from the decree in the archonship of Gorgias, Plutarch, *op. cit.*, 847D, and from the fact that pro-Macedonians were in power from 279 on.

we have a bit of gossip preserved which shows that he did not.¹ It reads as follows:

Δημοχάρους δὲ τοῦ Λάχηςτος ἀσπαζομένου αὐτὸν καὶ φάσκοντος λέγειν καὶ γράφειν ὧν ἂν χρεῖαν ἔχῃ πρὸς Ἀντίγονον, ὥς ἐκείνου πάντα παρέξοντος, ἀκούσας οὐκέτι αὐτῷ συνδιέτριψε.

"When Demochares, son of Laches, greeted him [Zeno] and said that he was in the habit of writing and telling Antigonos whatever he needed (the king, he said, would grant him everything), Zeno became angry and would have nothing more to do with Demochares."

This story, if true, and there seems no reason to doubt it, proves clearly that Demochares had become reconciled to Antigonos, corresponded with him, and felt that he had no little influence. The cause of Zeno's anger is not clear. He may have thought Demochares a turncoat; surely he was not jealous of him. At any rate we can now reconcile Laches' motion with a Macedonian government; for Antigonos would not object to the honors sought for his friend Demochares, who was now a personal friend, though his political career had in the main been hostile to him from 294 to 284. The reserved wording of the decree with its emphasis on Demochares' services in 307-304 can be explained only by assuming that a pro-Macedonian party was in control at the time.

There is no likelihood that Antigonos lost control of Athens at any time during the next three years. One of his friends was presiding officer in the assembly in December, 268.² Some time between the end of this year and the following August the Nationalist party under the leadership of Chremonides gained control of the government and with the aid of Ptolemy allied itself with Sparta and her allies and declared war on Antigonos. The story of this war and its conclusion in the fall of 262 is well known. Our reconstruction of the secretary-cycle adds little. The date of the beginning of the war is changed to 267.³ The first year's campaign was successful;

¹ Diogenes Laertios vii. 14. Ferguson has a different interpretation of this passage (*Hellenistic Athens*, 172).

² *IG*, II², 702.

³ It is quite clear that this date is correct. According to Pausanias, Areus was not killed in the first year's campaign (iii. 6. 4 ff.). This, combined with Diodoros xx. 29. 1, seems to me incontrovertible support for my contention.

	Year B.C.	Archon	Tribe of Secretary*	1	2	3
I.	295/294	Nikostratos	Aiantis	XI	XI	XI
0	294/293	Olympiodoros	V?	12	12
0	293/292	Philippos	?	1
i.	292/291	Kimón	Hippothontis	X	2
0	291/290	Aristonymos	Antigonis	I	3	1
0	290/289	Charinos	Demetrias	II	4	2
i.	289/288	Xenophon	<i>Erechtheis</i>	3	5
0	288/287	Diokles	Aigeis	IV	6	IV
0	287/286	Diotimos	Pandionis	V	IV	V
i.	286/285	Isaios	<i>Leontis</i>	6	V
0	285/284	Euthios	Akamantis	VII	6	VII
i.	284/283	Gorgias	<i>Oineis</i>	8	VII	IX
0	283/282	Oúrios	Kekropis	IX	XI	XI
0	282/281	Sosistratos	<i>Hippothontis</i>	10	XII	XII
I-? ...	281/280	Menekles†	Aiantis	XI	1	1
0	280/279	Nikias	Antiochis	XII	2	2
		Otryneus				
	279/278	Anaxikrates	<i>Antigonis</i>	1	3	3
	278/277	Demokles	<i>Demetrias</i>	2	4	4
	277/276λαιος	<i>Erechtheis</i>	3	5	5
	276/275	Euboulos	<i>Aigeis</i>	4	6	6
	275/274	Telokles	<i>Pandionis</i>	5	VII	VII
I.	274/273	Thymochares	<i>Leontis</i>	6	VIII	VIII
0	273/272	Polyeuktos	Akamantis	VII	IX	9
I.	272/271	Hieron	Oineis	VIII	10	10
	271/270	Pytharatos	<i>Kekropis</i>	9	11	11
	270/269	Philoneos	<i>Hippothontis</i>	10	12	12
	269/268	Theophilos	Aiantis	XI	1	1
I.	268/267	IG, II ² , 702, 703	Antiochis	XII	II	II
0	267/266	Peithidemos	<i>Antigonis</i>	I	3	3
I.	266/265	Philokrates	Demetrias	II	4	4
0-? ...	265/264ιδης	<i>Erechtheis</i>	3	5	5
0	264/263	Diognetos	Aigeis	IV	6	6
I.	263/262	Glaukippos	Pandionis	V	7	7
0	262/261	{ Antipatros	<i>Leontis</i>	6	8	8
		{ Arrheneides	<i>Antigonis</i>	1

*The tables are arranged as follows: The first column of figures following the tribes gives the cycle as it has been constructed in this paper. Ferguson and Kirchner continue the rotation without any break from 295/294 to 262/261. The second column gives Kolbe's arrangement of the cycle, and the third Tarn's. The latter does not make any comment about the cycle in 294-291. Roman numerals signify that the tribe of the secretary is known; Arabic numerals, the theoretical restoration.

†Inscriptions from Menekles' year call for some comment. I have already indicated that IG, II², 662, 663, should be transferred to Diokles' year, as the restoration ἐν Διοκλέους alone fills the lacuna in 662. The only alternative is that Lysimachos was still alive in 280, but there seems little doubt that he died in 281. Of the other inscriptions, IG, II², 661, refers to sacrifices at the Lesser Eleusinia in 280 for the safety of the state. These had already been offered in 283-282 at the Greater Eleusinia and were again offered two years later. The intervening Mysteries had been in time of comparative peace, hence sacrifices for safety were not necessary. The year of Menekles seems to have been intercalary. In IG, II², 664, line 4, the restoration may be ἐν ἡμέρῃ καὶ δεκάτῃ, εἰκοστῇ τῆς πρυτανείας ὅτ' ἐνέει καὶ νέαι, τριακοστῇ τῆς πρυτανείας κτλ. If the former is correct, the scheme of the prytanies belongs to an intercalary year, and if we do not allow this restoration, four ordinary years follow in succession. Assuming that the year is intercalary, the extra month was put in after Anthesterion (IG, II², 664). It may be noted that IG, II², 664, does not fit into Kirchner's scheme of the prytanies (see notes on IG, II², 663). It should also be noted that in the old scheme of the cycle by which these inscriptions were dated in 282, the friendly relations of Athens with Lysimachos are more than doubtful after the murder of Agathokles.

for the Athenians could praise their taxiarchs.¹ In the second campaign Areus was killed;² from then on the priests received more praise than the generals, and sacrifices for safety became the order of the day.³ In the last year of the war (263/262) these sacrifices were offered all through the campaigning season. The war ended in the autumn of 262,⁴ and Antigonos gave the people no mercy. The officials of the year were changed and a strong garrison was placed in the city. The old democracy was crushed, not to revive for another generation.

Those archons belonging to the years 294–262, which must be redated in accordance with the cycle as we have reconstructed it, are given on the preceding page in tabular form for convenience of reference.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

¹ *IG*, II², 685.

² See note 3, p. 276.

³ *IG*, II², 674, 676, 689. The placing of Glaukippos in 277/276 in the old cycle was incorrect, because there was no war in which Athens was engaged which would make these sacrifices for safety justifiable.

⁴ Kolbe, *op. cit.*, 39–55; Mayer, *Phil.* (1912), 211.